

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-6, 9 and 12-18 are pending in the present application. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 15 contains allowable subject matter. However, in view of the the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-6, 9, 12-14, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Piet et al. (European Published App. No. EP 1,349,098) in view of Van Liere (U.S. Published App. No. 2002/0067340).

Claim 1 recites “[a] method of processing user interaction in a medical environment with a medical image for producing measurement data related to graphics on the medical image, the method comprising: *attaching a dynamic measurement object to a first graphic object displayed on a monitor, the dynamic measurement object including measurement data related to the first graphic object; detaching, via a user interface device, the dynamic measurement object from the first graphic object; and attaching, via the user interface device, the dynamic measurement object to a second graphic object displayed on the monitor, wherein the measurement data is modified to be related to the second graphic object.*”

Piet discloses three windows: a template window, an image window, and a measurement window. (See Piet, Fig. 2). Points from template window “are placed manually in the image by cursor clicks.” (*Id.* at ¶ [0097], Figs. 1-4). The template window merely serves to impose “the placement order by highlighting each point in sequence (e.g. by blinking the point in the template).” (*Id.*). Piet also discloses an automated placement that carries out this function. (*Id.* at ¶¶ [0107]-[0109]). In either case, “[m]easurment values may be displayed either discretely or continuously in the

measurement values window as the user moves the position of a point over the image.” (*Id.* at ¶ [0116], Figs. 1-4).

In contrast, claim 1 recites “*attaching a dynamic measurement object to a first graphic object... the dynamic measurement object including measurement data related to the first graphic object.*” The same dynamic measurement object is later detached from the first graphics object and attached to “*a second graphic object...wherein the measurement data is modified to be related to the second graphic object.*” For example, if the dynamic measurement object is attached to a line, it will display the measurement data relating to that line (e.g. length = 3 in.). If that same dynamic measurement object is detached from the line and attached to a different line, the dynamic measurement object will display the measurement data relating to the second line (e.g. length = 5 in.). There is no detachment of any points in Piet and placement of those points at a second position. The Examiner realizes this deficiency and correctly acknowledges that Piet fails to disclose or suggest “*attaching, via the user interface device, the dynamic measurement object to a second graphic object displayed on the monitor, wherein the measurement data is modified to be related to the second graphic object.*” (See 6/25/10 Office Action, pp. 4-5).

To cure the deficiencies of Piet, the Examiner refers to Van Liere. Specifically, the Examiner refers to paragraphs [0045]-[0055] of Van Liere and states that “[d]etaching the dynamic measurement is taught when the first point is being displayed then removed and vice versa.” (*Id.* at p. 3). However, this passage of Van Liere merely explains the different types of measurements and annotations and explains how to create them. Nowhere in this passage does Van Liere disclose or suggest that “the first point is being displayed then removed and vice versa,” as suggested by the Examiner. The method disclosed by Van Liere consists of identifying one or more points so that a measurement (or annotation) can be created.

Van Liere discloses interaction with a computer-displayed medical image. The Examiner refers to Van Liere’s disclosure of steps used to create graphics object using a

“click-move-click” operation or a “press-drag-release” operation. (See Van Liere, ¶¶ [0032]-[0042]). Subsequently, Van Liere discloses point, line, angle, curve, and region-of-interest measurements. However, as stated in the present application Van Liere’s measurements “are static and it is not possible to interact with these measurements, except in some cases for moving the location of the measurement label.” (See Specification, ¶ [0005]). Accordingly, Van Liere fails to disclose or suggest “*and attaching, via the user interface device, the dynamic measurement object to a second graphic object displayed on the monitor, wherein the measurement data is modified to be related to the second graphic object.*”

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Piet nor Van Liere, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest “attaching a dynamic measurement object to a first graphic...the dynamic measurement object including measurement data related to the first graphic object” and “detaching...the dynamic measurement object from the first graphic object; and attaching...the dynamic measurement object to a second graphic object...*wherein the measurement data is modified to be related to the second graphic object,*” as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and its dependent claims 2-6, 9 and 16-18 are allowable.


Claims 12 and 13 recite the method of claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 14 recites “a second code segment (112) for removably attaching at least one dynamic measurement object based on said measurement data to said graphic object.” Since Piet neither teaches nor suggests a removably attached dynamic measurement object, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is also allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 25, 2010

By: 
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276